arXiv:1609.02086v2 [math.AT] 1 Nov 2016

Stability of higher-dimensional interval decomposable persistence modules

Håvard Bakke Bjerkevik

November 2, 2016

Abstract

The algebraic stability theorem for pointwise finite dimensional (p.f.d.) $\mathbb{R}$-persistence modules is a central result in the theory of stability for persistence modules. We present a stability theorem for n-dimensional rectangle decomposable p.f.d. persistence modules up to a constant $(2n-1)$ that is a generalization of the algebraic stability theorem. We give an example to show that the bound cannot be improved for $n = 2$. The same technique is then applied to free n-dimensional modules and what we call triangle decomposable modules, where we obtain smaller constants. The result for triangle decomposable modules combined with work by Botnan and Lesnick proves a version of the algebraic stability theorem for zigzag modules and the persistent homology of Reeb graphs. We also prove slightly weaker versions of the results for interval decomposable modules that are not assumed to be p.f.d.

This work grew out of my master's degree at the Department of Mathematical Sciences at NTNU [4].

1 Introduction

Persistent homology is a tool in topological data analysis used to determine the structure or shape of data sets. For example, given a point cloud $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ sampled from a subspace S of $\mathbb{R}^n$, we want to guess at the homology of S, which tells us something about how many "holes" S has in various dimensions. We can do this by defining $B(\epsilon)$ to be the union of the (open or closed) balls of radius ϵ centered at each point in X. Calculating homology, we get a group or vector space $H_n(B(\epsilon))$ for each $\epsilon \geq 0$, and the inclusions $B(\epsilon) \hookrightarrow B(\epsilon')$ induce morphisms $H_n(B(\epsilon)) \to H_n(B(\epsilon'))$ for $\epsilon \leq \epsilon'$. Such a collection of vector spaces and morphisms is called a *persistence module*. Under certain assumptions, we can decompose a persistence module into *interval modules*, which gives us a set of intervals uniquely determining the persistence module up to isomorphism. This set of intervals is the *barcode* of the persistence module. The intervals in the barcode are interpreted as corresponding to possible features of the space S, where long intervals are more likely to describe actual features of S, and

short intervals are more likely to be the result of noise in the input data. In other words, we have an algorithm with a data set as input and a barcode as output. As data sets always carry a certain amount of noise, we would like this algorithm to be *stable* in the sense that a little change in the input data, or in the persistence modules, should not result in a big change in the barcode.

We measure the difference between persistence modules with the *interleaving distance* d_I, and the difference between barcodes with the *bottleneck distance* d_B. Proving stability then becomes a question of proving that the bottleneck distance is bounded by the interleaving distance, i.e. $d_B \leq Cd_I$ for some constant C. Stability has been proved for persistence modules over $\mathbb{R}$ [3, 6, 7, 8] in what is called the *algebraic stability theorem*, which implies the *isometry theorem* $d_I = d_B$.

The main focus for this article is stability for persistence modules over other posets, usually $\mathbb{R}^n$, where less is known. Our main result is Theorem 3.2:

Theorem. *Let $M = \bigoplus_{I \in B(M)} \mathbb{I}^I$ and $N = \bigoplus_{J \in B(N)} \mathbb{I}^J$ be p.f.d. rectangle decomposable $\mathbb{R}^n$-modules. If M and N are δ-interleaved, there exists a $(2n-1)\delta$-matching between $B(M)$ and $B(N)$.*

This implies $d_B(M,N) \leq (2n-1)d_I(M,N)$ for p.f.d. *rectangle decomposable* $\mathbb{R}^n$-modules M and N. Putting $n = 1$ in the theorem, we get the algebraic stability theorem for $\mathbb{R}$-modules, so Theorem 3.2 is a generalization.

In section 4, we give an example of 2-dimensional rectangle decomposable modules M and N for which $d_B(M,N) = 3d_I(M,N)$, which shows that the constant $(2n-1)$ is the best possible for $n = 2$. This disproves a conjecture made in an earlier version of [5] claiming that $d_B(M,N) = d_I(M,N)$ holds for all n-dimensional p.f.d. interval decomposable modules M and N whose barcodes only contain convex intervals.

Using the same technique as we did in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we prove analogous results implying

$$d_B \leq (n-1)d_I$$

for *free* $\mathbb{R}^n$-modules, and

$$d_B = d_I$$

for *triangle decomposable* modules. The latter result fills the gap in [5] both needed to prove $d_B = d_I$ for *zigzag modules* (in [5], $d_B \leq \frac{5}{2}d_I$ is proved), and to prove stability for the persistent homology of Reeb graphs up to a constant that cannot be improved.

Inspired by our use of graph theory to prove Theorem 3.2, we devote section 5 to using graph theory to give criteria for when results similar to Lemma 3.8 give stability in a more general setting. We apply Theorem 5.2 to show Corollaries 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5, which say that

$$\begin{aligned} d_B &\leq (2n-1)d_I, \\ d_B &\leq (n-1)d_I, \\ d_B &= d_I \end{aligned}$$

hold for rectangle decomposable, free, and triangle decomposable modules, respectively, even with the p.f.d. condition removed. Once again, this implies the isometry theorem for a class of $\mathbb{R}$-modules, but this time it holds for all interval decomposable $\mathbb{R}$-modules. In all previous proofs of the isometry theorem that we know of, the modules have been assumed to be either p.f.d. or q-tame, so our result is a generalization.

2 Persistence modules, interleavings, and matchings

In this section we introduce some basic notation and definitions that we will use throughout the paper, except in section 5, where we work with more general definitions. We mostly follow [5], but most of the definitions can be found in some form in earlier papers like [6] or [7] for the 1-dimensional case.

Let k be a field that stays fixed throughout the text, and let **Vec** be the category of vector spaces over k.

Definition 2.1. Let P be a poset category. A P-**persistence module** is a functor $P \to \mathbf{Vec}$.

If the choice of poset is obvious from the context, we usually write 'persistence module' or just 'module' instead of 'P-persistence module'. If the vector spaces at all points $p \in P$ are finite-dimensional, we call the persistence module *pointwise finite-dimensional*, or *p.f.d.*

For a persistence module M and $p \leq q \in P$, $M(p)$ is denoted by M_p and $M(p \to q)$ by $\phi_M(p,q)$. We refer to the morphisms $\phi_M(p,q)$ as the *internal morphisms* of M. M being a functor implies that $\phi_M(p,p) = id_{M_p}$, and that $\phi_M(q,r) \circ \phi_M(p,q) = \phi_M(p,r)$. Because the persistence modules are defined as functors, they automatically assemble into a category where the morphisms are natural transformations. This category is denoted by P-**mod**. Let $f : M \to N$ be a morphism between persistence modules. Such an f consists of a morphism associated to each $p \in P$, and these morphisms are denoted by f_p. Because f is a natural transformation, we have $\phi_N(p,q) \circ f_p = f_q \circ \phi_M(p,q)$ for all $p \leq q$.

Definition 2.2. An **interval** is a subset $\varnothing \neq I \subseteq P$ that satisfies the following:

- If $p, q \in I$ and $p \leq r \leq q$, then $r \in I$.
- If $p, q \in I$, then there exist $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_{2m} \in I$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p \leq p_1 \geq p_2 \leq p_3 \geq \cdots \geq p_{2m} \leq q$.

We refer to the last point as the *connectivity axiom* for intervals.

Definition 2.3. An **interval persistence module** or *interval module* is a persistence module M that satisfies the following: for some interval I, $M_p = k$ for $p \in I$ and $M_p = 0$ otherwise, and $\phi_M(p,q) = \mathrm{Id}_k$ for points $p \leq q$ in I. We use the notation $\mathbb{I}^J$ for the interval module with J as its underlying interval.

The definitions up to this point have been valid for all posets P, but we need some additional structure on P to get a notion of distance between persistence modules, which is essential to prove stability results. Since we will mostly be working with $\mathbb{R}^n$-persistence modules, we restrict ourselves to this case from now on. We define the poset structure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ by letting $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \leq (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n)$ if and only if $a_i \leq b_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. For $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, we often abuse notation and write ϵ when we mean $(\epsilon, \epsilon, \ldots, \epsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We call an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *bounded* if it is bounded as a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ in the usual sense. That is, it is contained in a ball with finite radius.

Definition 2.4. For $\epsilon \in [0, \infty)$, we define the **shift functor** $(\cdot)(\epsilon) : \mathbb{R}^n$**-mod** $\to \mathbb{R}^n$**-mod** by letting $M(\epsilon)$ be the persistence module with $M(\epsilon)_p = M_{p+\epsilon}$ and $\phi_{M(\epsilon)}(p, q) = \phi_M(p + \epsilon, q + \epsilon)$. For morphisms $f : M \to N$, we define $f(\epsilon) : M(\epsilon) \to N(\epsilon)$ by $f(\epsilon)_p = f_{p+\epsilon}$.

We also define shift on intervals I by letting $I(\epsilon)$ be the interval for which $\mathbb{I}^{I(\epsilon)} = \mathbb{I}^I(\epsilon)$.

Define the morphism $\phi_{M,\epsilon} : M \to M(\epsilon)$ by $(\phi_{M,\epsilon})_p = \phi_M(p, p + \epsilon)$.

Definition 2.5. An ϵ**-interleaving** between $\mathbb{R}^n$-modules M and N is a pair of morphisms $f : M \to N(\epsilon)$, $g : N \to M(\epsilon)$ such that $g(\epsilon) \circ f = \phi_{M,2\epsilon}$ and $f(\epsilon) \circ g = \phi_{N,2\epsilon}$.

If there exists an ϵ-interleaving between M and N, then M and N are said to be ϵ-interleaved. An interleaving can be viewed as an 'approximate isomorphism', and a 0-interleaving is in fact an isomorphism. We call a module M *ϵ-significant* if $\phi_M(p, p + \epsilon) \neq 0$ for some p, and *ϵ-trivial* otherwise. M is 2ϵ-trivial if and only if it is ϵ-interleaved with the zero module. We call an interval I ϵ-significant if $\mathbb{I}^I$ is ϵ-significant, and ϵ-trivial otherwise.

Definition 2.6. We define the **interleaving distance** d_I on persistence modules M and N by

$$d_I(M, N) = \inf\{\epsilon \mid M \text{ and } N \text{ are } \epsilon\text{-interleaved}\}. \tag{1}$$

The interleaving distance intuitively measures how close the modules are to being isomorphic. The interleaving distance between two modules might be infinite, and the interleaving distance between two different, even non-isomorphic modules, might be zero. Apart from this, d_I satisfies the axioms for a metric, so d_I is an extended pseudometric.

Definition 2.7. Suppose $M \cong \bigoplus_{I \in B} \mathbb{I}^I$ for a multiset[1] B of intervals. Then we call B the **barcode** of M, and write $B = B(M)$. We say that M is **interval decomposable**.

[1] We will not be rigorous in our treatment of multisets in this paper. A multiset may contain multiple copies of one element, but we will assume that we have some way of separating the copies, so that we can treat the multiset as a set. If e.g. I and J are intervals in a multiset and we say that $I \neq J$, we mean that they are 'different' elements of the multiset, not that they are different intervals.

Since the endomorphism ring of any interval module is isomorphic to k, it follows from Theorem 1 in [2] that if a persistence module M is interval decomposable, the decomposition is unique up to isomorphism. Thus the barcode is well-defined, even if we let M be a P-module for an arbitrary poset P. If M is a p.f.d. $\mathbb{R}$-module, it is interval decomposable [9], but this is not true for $\mathbb{R}$-modules or p.f.d. $\mathbb{R}^n$-modules in general. Webb [11] gives an example showing the former, and the following is an example of a P-module for a poset P with four points that is not interval decomposable.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} k & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix}1 & 0\end{pmatrix}} & k^2 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix}1\\1\end{pmatrix}} & k \\ & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \begin{pmatrix}0 & 1\end{pmatrix}} & & \\ & & k & & \end{array} \tag{2}$$

A corresponding $\mathbb{R}^2$-module that is not interval decomposable and is at most two-dimensional at each point can be constructed.

For multisets A, B, we define a *partial bijection* as a bijection $\sigma : A' \to B'$ for some subsets $A' \subset A$ and $B' \subset B$, and we write $\sigma : A \nrightarrow B$. We write $\operatorname{coim} \sigma = A'$ and $\operatorname{im} \sigma = B'$.

Definition 2.8. Let A and B be multisets of intervals. An **ϵ-matching** between A and B is a partial bijection $\sigma : A \nrightarrow B$ such that

- all $I \in A \setminus \operatorname{coim} \sigma$ are 2ϵ-trivial
- all $I \in B \setminus \operatorname{im} \sigma$ are 2ϵ-trivial
- for all $I \in \operatorname{coim} \sigma$, $\mathbb{I}^I$ and $\mathbb{I}^{\sigma(I)}$ are ϵ-interleaved.

If there is an ϵ-matching between $B(M)$ and $B(N)$ for persistence modules M and N, we say that M and N are *ϵ-matched*.

We have adopted this definition of ϵ-matching from [5], which differs from e.g. the one in [7], which allows two intervals I and J to be matched if $d_I(\mathbb{I}^I, \mathbb{I}^J) \leq \epsilon$ (or rather, this is equivalent to their definition). Conveniently, with the definition we have chosen, an ϵ-interleaving is easily constructed given an ϵ-matching. We feel that this is the more natural definition for this paper, as several of our results are phrased as statements about matchings and interleavings, and the interleaving distance might not come into the picture at all. The other definition is perhaps more natural in the context of 'persistence diagrams', where intervals are identified with points in a diagram, and the interleaving distance between the corresponding modules is simply the distance between the points. This is irrelevant to us, however, as we never consider persistence diagrams.

We can also define ϵ-matchings in the context of graph theory. A *matching in a graph* is a set of edges in the graph without common vertices, and a matching is said to *cover* a set S of vertices if all elements in S are adjacent to an edge

in the matching. Let G_ϵ be the bipartite graph on $A \sqcup B$ with an edge between $I \in A$ and $J \in B$ if $\mathbb{I}^I$ and $\mathbb{I}^J$ are ϵ-interleaved. Then an ϵ-matching between A and B is a matching in G_ϵ such that the set of 2ϵ-significant intervals in $A \sqcup B$ is covered.

Definition 2.9. The **bottleneck distance** d_B is defined by

$$d_B(M, N) = \inf\{\epsilon \mid M \text{ and } N \text{ are } \epsilon\text{-matched}\} \tag{3}$$

for any interval decomposable M and N.

3 Higher-dimensional stability

The algebraic stability theorem for $\mathbb{R}$-modules states that an ϵ-interleaving between p.f.d. $\mathbb{R}$-modules M and N induces an ϵ-matching between $B(M)$ and $B(N)$, implying $d_I(M, N) = d_B(M, N)$, the isometry theorem. The main purpose of this paper is to find out when similar results for $\mathbb{R}^n$-modules hold. Our first result, Theorem 3.2, is a generalization of the algebraic stability theorem for p.f.d. $\mathbb{R}$-modules. Variations of the algebraic stability theorem have been proved several times already [3, 6, 7], but this is a new proof with ideas that are applicable to more than just $\mathbb{R}$-modules.

In this section, we assume all modules to be p.f.d. In section 5 we will prove slightly weaker versions of Theorems 3.2, 3.11, and 3.14 with the p.f.d. condition removed.

3.1 Rectangle decomposable modules

For any interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we let its projection on the i'th coordinate be denoted by I_i.

Definition 3.1. A **rectangle** is an interval of the form $R = R_1 \times R_2 \times \cdots \times R_n$.

Two rectangles R and S are of the *same type* if $R_i \setminus S_i$ and $S_i \setminus R_i$ are bounded for every i. For $n = 1$, we have four types of rectangles:

- intervals of finite length
- intervals of the form (a, ∞) or $[a, \infty)$
- intervals of the form $(-\infty, a)$ or $(-\infty, a]$
- $(-\infty, \infty)$,

for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$. We see that for $n \geq 1$, rectangles R and S are of the same type if R_i and S_i are of the same type for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Examples of 2-dimensional rectangles are given in Figure 1.

In [7], *decorated numbers* were introduced. These are endpoints of intervals 'decorated' with a plus or minus sign depending on whether the endpoints are



Figure 1: Three rectangles, where the left and middle rectangles are of the same type (unbounded downwards), while the last is of a different type (unbounded upwards and to the right). Assuming that it contains its boundary, the rightmost rectangle is also an example of a free interval, which we will define in a later section.

included in the interval or not. Let $\bar{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$. A decorated number is of the form a^+ or a^-, where $a \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}$.[2] The notation is as follows for $a, b \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}$:

- $I = (a^+, b^+)$ if $I = (a, b]$
- $I = (a^+, b^-)$ if $I = (a, b)$
- $I = (a^-, b^+)$ if $I = [a, b]$
- $I = (a^-, b^-)$ if $I = [a, b)$.

We define decorated points in n dimensions for $n \geq 1$ as tuples $a = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$, where all the a_i's are decorated numbers. For an n-dimensional rectangle R and decorated points $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$ and $(b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n)$, we write $R = ((a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n), (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n))$ if $R_i = (a_i, b_i)$ for all i. We define $\min_R$ and $\max_R$ as the decorated points for which $R = (\min_R, \max_R)$. We write a^* for decorated numbers with unknown 'decoration', so a^* is either a^+ or a^-.

There is a total order on the decorated numbers given by $a^* < b^*$ for $a < b$, and $a^- < a^+$ for all $a, b \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}$. This induces a poset structure on decorated n-dimensional points given by $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \leq (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n)$ if $a_i \leq b_i$ for all i. We can also add decorated numbers and real numbers by letting $a^+ + x = (a + x)^+$ and $a^- + x = (a + x)^-$ for $a \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$. We add n-dimensional decorated points and n-tuples of real numbers coordinatewise.

If M is an interval decomposable $\mathbb{R}^n$-module and all $I \in B(M)$ are rectangles, M is *rectangle decomposable*.

Our goal is to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 3.2. *Let $M = \bigoplus_{I \in B(M)} \mathbb{I}^I$ and $N = \bigoplus_{J \in B(N)} \mathbb{I}^J$ be p.f.d. rectangle decomposable $\mathbb{R}^n$-modules. If M and N are δ-interleaved, there exists a $(2n-1)\delta$-matching between $B(M)$ and $B(N)$.*

[2]The decorated numbers $-\infty^-$ and ∞^+ are never used, as no interval contains points at infinity, but it does not matter whether we include these two points in the definition.

Fix $0 \leq \delta \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that M and N are δ-interleaved, with interleaving morphisms $f : M \to N(\delta)$ and $g : N \to M(\delta)$. Recall that this means that $g(\delta) \circ f = \phi_{M,2\delta}$ and $f(\delta) \circ g = \phi_{N,2\delta}$. For any $I \in B(M)$, we have a canonical injection $\mathbb{I}^I \xrightarrow{\iota_I} M$ and projection $M \xrightarrow{\pi_I} \mathbb{I}^I$, and likewise, we have canonical morphisms $\mathbb{I}^J \xrightarrow{\iota_J} N$ and $N \xrightarrow{\pi_J} \mathbb{I}^J$ for $J \in B(N)$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} f_{I,J} &= \pi_J(\delta) \circ f \circ \iota_I : \mathbb{I}^I \to \mathbb{I}^J(\delta) \\ g_{J,I} &= \pi_I(\delta) \circ g \circ \iota_J : \mathbb{I}^J \to \mathbb{I}^I(\delta). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

We prove the theorem by a mix of combinatorial and geometric arguments. First we show that it is enough to prove the theorem under the assumption that all the rectangles in $B(M)$ and $B(N)$ are of the same type. Then we define a real-valued function α on the set of rectangles which in a sense measures, in the case $n = 2$, how far 'up and to the right' a rectangle is. There is a preorder $\leq_\alpha$ associated to α. The idea behind $\leq_\alpha$ is that if there is a nonzero morphism $\chi : \mathbb{I}^I \to \mathbb{I}^J(\epsilon)$ and $I \leq_\alpha J$, then I and J have to be close to each other. Finding pairs of intervals in $B(M)$ and $B(N)$ that are close is exactly what we need to construct a $(2n-1)\delta$-matching. Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 say that such morphisms behave nicely in a precise sense that we will exploit when we prove Lemma 3.8. If we remove the conditions mentioning $\leq_\alpha$, Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 are not even close to being true, so one of the main points in the proof of Lemma 3.8 is that we must exclude the cases that are not covered by Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7. We do this by proving that a certain matrix is upper triangular, where the 'bad cases' correspond to the elements above the diagonal and the 'good cases' correspond to elements on and below the diagonal.

Lemma 3.8 is what ties together the geometric and combinatorial parts of the proof of Theorem 3.2. While we prove Lemma 3.8 by geometric arguments, by Hall's marriage theorem the lemma is equivalent to a statement about matchings between $B(M)$ and $B(N)$. We have to do some combinatorics to get exactly the statement we need, namely that there is a $(2n-1)\delta$-matching between $B(M)$ and $B(N)$, and we do this after stating Lemma 3.8.

We begin by describing morphisms between rectangle modules.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\chi : \mathbb{I}^I \to \mathbb{I}^J$ be a morphism between interval modules. Suppose $A = I \cap J$ is an interval. Then, for all $a, b \in A$, $\chi_a = \chi_b$ as k-endomorphisms.*

Proof. Suppose $a \leq b$ and $a, b \in A$. Then $\chi_b \circ \phi_{\mathbb{I}^I}(a, b) = \phi_{\mathbb{I}^J}(a, b) \circ \chi_a$. Since the ϕ-morphisms are identities, we get $\chi_a = \chi_b$ as k-endomorphisms. By the connectivity axiom for intervals, the equality extends to all elements in A. □

Since the intersection of two rectangles is either empty or a rectangle, we can describe a morphism between two rectangle modules uniquely as a k-endomorphism if their underlying rectangles intersect. A k-endomorphism, in turn, is simply multiplication by a constant. Note that we could have relaxed the assumptions in the proof above and assumed that a is in I instead of in A, and still have gotten $\chi_a = \chi_b$. In particular, this means that if $0 \neq \chi : \mathbb{I}^I \to \mathbb{I}^J$, and I and

J are rectangles, then $\min_{J_i} \leq \min_{I_i}$ for all i, which gives $\min_J \leq \min_I$. Similarly, $\max_J \leq \max_I$, and one can also see that $\min_I < \max_J$ must hold, or else $I \cap J = \varnothing$. We summarize these observations as a corollary of Lemma 3.3:

Corollary 3.4. *Let R and S be rectangles, and let $\chi : \mathbb{I}^R \to \mathbb{I}^S$ be a nonzero morphism. Then $min_S \leq min_R$ and $max_S \leq max_R$.*

This will come in handy when we prove Lemmas 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7.

We define a function $w : (B(M) \times B(N)) \sqcup (B(N) \times B(M)) \to k$ by letting $w(I, J) = x$ if $f_{I,J}$ is given by multiplication by x, and $w(I, J) = 0$ if $f_{I,J}$ is the zero morphism. $w(J, I)$ is given by $g_{J,I}$ in the same way.

With the definition of w, it is starting to become clear how combinatorics comes into the picture. We can now construct a bipartite weighted directed graph on $B(M) \sqcup B(N)$ by letting $w(I, J)$ be the weight of the edge from I to J. The reader is invited to keep this picture in mind, as a lot of what we do in the rest of the proof can be interpreted as statements about the structure of this graph.

The following lemma allows us to break up the problem and focus on the components of M and N with the same types separately.

Lemma 3.5. *Let R and T be rectangles of the same type, and S be a rectangle of a different type. Then $\psi\chi = 0$ for any pair $\chi : \mathbb{I}^R \to \mathbb{I}^S$, $\psi : \mathbb{I}^S \to \mathbb{I}^T$ of morphisms.*

Proof. Suppose $\psi, \chi \neq 0$. By Corollary 3.4, $\min_R \geq \min_S \geq \min_T$ and $\max_R \geq \max_S \geq \max_T$. We get $\min_{R_i} \geq \min_{S_i} \geq \min_{T_i}$ and $\max_{R_i} \geq \max_{S_i} \geq \max_{T_i}$ for all i, and it follows that if R and T are of the same type, then S is of the same type as R and T. □

Let $f' : M \to N(\delta)$ be defined by $f'_{I,J} = f_{I,J}$ for $I \in B(M)$ and $J \in B(N)$ if I and J are of the same type, and $f'_{I,J} = 0$ if they are not, and let $g' : N \to M(\delta)$ be defined analogously. Here f' and g' are assembled from $f'_{I,J}$ and $g'_{J,I}$ the same way f and g are from $f_{I,J}$ and $g_{J,I}$. Suppose $I, I' \in B(M)$. Then we have

$$\sum_{J \in B(N)} g_{J,I'}(\delta) f_{I,J} = \sum_{J \in B(N)} g'_{J,I'}(\delta) f'_{I,J}. \tag{5}$$

When I and I' are of different types, the left side is zero because f and g are δ-interleaving morphisms, and all the summands on the right side are zero by definition of f' and g'. When I and I' are of the same type, the equality follows from Lemma 3.5. This means that $g'(\delta)f' = g(\delta)f$. We also have $f'(\delta)g' = f(\delta)g$, so f' and g' are δ-interleaving morphisms. In particular, f' and g' are δ-interleaving morphisms when restricted to the components of M and N of a fixed type. If we can show that f' and g' induce a $(2n-1)\delta$-matching on each of the mentioned components, we will have proved Theorem 3.2. In other words, we have reduced the problem to the case where all the intervals in $B(M)$ and $B(N)$ are of the same type.

For a decorated number a^*, let $u(a^*) = a$ if $a \neq \pm\infty$ and $u(a^*) = 0$ otherwise. Let $a = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$ be a decorated point. We define $P(a)$ to be the number of the decorated numbers a_i decorated with $+$, and we also define $\alpha(a) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} u(a_i)$. What we really want to look at are rectangles and not decorated points by themselves, so we define $P(R) = P(\min_R) + P(\max_R)$ and $\alpha(R) = \alpha(\min_R) + \alpha(\max_R)$ for rectangles R. Define an order $\leq_\alpha$ on decorated points given by $a \leq_\alpha b$ if either

- $\alpha(a) < \alpha(b)$, or
- $\alpha(a) = \alpha(b)$ and $P(a) \leq P(b)$

This defines a preorder. In other words, it is transitive ($R \leq_\alpha S \leq_\alpha T$ implies $R \leq_\alpha T$) and reflexive ($R \leq_\alpha R$ for all R). We write $R <_\alpha S$ if $R \leq_\alpha S$ and not $R \geq_\alpha S$.

The order $\leq_\alpha$ is one of the most important ingredients in the proof. The point is that if there is a nonzero morphism from $\mathbb{I}^R$ to $\mathbb{I}^S(\epsilon)$ and $R \leq_\alpha S$, then R and S have to be close to each other. If $\epsilon = 0$, R and S actually have to be equal. This 'closeness property' is expressed in Lemma 3.6, and is also exploited in Lemma 3.7. Finally, in the proof of Lemma 3.8, we make sure that we only have to deal with morphisms $g_{J,I'}(\delta) \circ f_{I,J}$ for $I \leq_\alpha I'$ and not $I >_\alpha I'$, so that our lemmas can be applied.

In Figure 2 we see two rectangles $R = (0,4) \times (0,4)$ and $S = (2,5) \times (2,5)$. There is no nonzero morphism from $\mathbb{I}^R$ to $\mathbb{I}^S$ or $\mathbb{I}^{S(1)}$, because $\min_R < \min_{S(\epsilon)}$ for all $\epsilon < 2$. This is connected to the fact that $\alpha(R) = 8 < 14 = \alpha(S)$, which can be interpreted to mean that R is 'further down and to the left' than S. The point of including $P(\alpha)$ in the definition of α is that e.g. $(a, b]$ is a tiny bit 'further to the right' than $[a, b)$, and this is a subtlety that P recognizes, and that matters in the proofs of Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7.

Lemma 3.6. *Let R, S, and T be rectangles of the same type with $R \leq_\alpha T$. Suppose there are nonzero morphisms $\chi : \mathbb{I}^R \to \mathbb{I}^S(\epsilon)$ and $\psi : \mathbb{I}^S \to \mathbb{I}^T(\epsilon)$. Then $\mathbb{I}^S$ is $(2n-1)\epsilon$-interleaved with either $\mathbb{I}^R$ or $\mathbb{I}^T$.*

Proof. Since $\chi \neq 0$, we have

- $\min_S \leq \min_R + \epsilon$
- $\max_S \leq \max_R + \epsilon$.

This follows from Corollary 3.4.

Suppose $\mathbb{I}^R$ and $\mathbb{I}^S$ are not $(2n-1)\epsilon$-interleaved. Then either $\min_S + (2n-1)\epsilon \not\geq \min_R$ or $\max_S + (2n-1)\epsilon \not\geq \max_R$; let us assume the latter. (The former is similar.) In this case, there is an m such that $\max_{S_m} < \max_{R_m} - (2n-1)\epsilon$.



Figure 2: Rectangles $R = (0,4)\times(0,4)$ (purple), $S = (2,5)\times(2,5)$ (pink), $S(1) = (1,4)\times(1,4)$ (dotted border), and $S(2) = (0,3)\times(0,3)$ (dotted border).

For $i \neq m$, we have $\max_{S_i} \leq \max_{R_i} + \epsilon$ by the second bullet point. We get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{1\leq i\leq n} u(\max_{S_i}) &\leq \left(\sum_{1\leq i\leq n} u(\max_{R_i})\right) - (2n-1)\epsilon + (n-1)\epsilon \\ &= \left(\sum_{1\leq i\leq n} u(\max_{R_i})\right) - n\epsilon.\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The first bullet point gives us

$$\sum_{1\leq i\leq n} u(\min_{S_i}) \leq \left(\sum_{1\leq i\leq n} u(\min_{R_i})\right) + n\epsilon, \tag{7}$$

so we get $\alpha(S) \leq \alpha(R)$. If the inequality is strict, we have $S <_\alpha R$. If not, we have

- $u(\min_{S_i}) = u(\min_{R_i}) + \epsilon$ for all i
- $u(\max_{S_i}) = u(\max_{R_i}) + \epsilon$ for $i \neq m$
- $u(\max_{S_m}) = u(\max_{R_m}) - (2n-1)\epsilon$.

Because of the inequalities $\min_S \leq \min_R + \epsilon$ and $\max_S \leq \max_R + \epsilon$ (recall that these are inequalities of decorated points with the poset structure we defined

earlier), we have $P(\min_{S_i}) \leq P(\min_{R_i})$ for all i and $P(\max_{S_i}) \leq P(\max_{R_i})$ for $i \neq m$. But since $\max_{S_m} < \max_{R_m} - (2n-1)\epsilon$, we have $P(\max_{S_m}) < P(\max_{R_m})$, so $S <_\alpha R$. Similarly, we can prove $T <_\alpha S$ if $\mathbb{I}^S$ and $\mathbb{I}^T$ are not $(2n-1)\epsilon$-interleaved, so we have $T <_\alpha R$, which is a contradiction. □

Lemma 3.7. *Let R, S, and T be rectangles of the same type with R and T $(4n-2)\epsilon$-significant and $\alpha(R) \leq \alpha(T)$. Suppose there are nonzero morphisms $\chi : \mathbb{I}^R \to \mathbb{I}^S(\epsilon)$ and $\psi : \mathbb{I}^S \to \mathbb{I}^T(\epsilon)$. Then $\psi(\epsilon) \circ \chi \neq 0$.*

The constant $(4n-2)$ can be improved on for $n > 1$, but since the constant $(2n-1)$ in Lemma 3.6 is optimal, strengthening Lemma 3.7 will not help us get a better constant in Theorem 3.2.

Proof. Suppose that χ and ψ are nonzero, but $\psi(\epsilon) \circ \chi = 0$. We have

- $\min_R + 2\epsilon \geq \min_T$
- $\min_{R_m} + 2\epsilon \geq \max_{T_m}$ for some m
- $\max_R + 2\epsilon \geq \max_T$
- $\max_{R_m} \geq \max_{T_m} + (4n-4)\epsilon$.

The first and third statements hold because $\chi, \psi \neq 0$. (See Corollary 3.4.) The second is equivalent to $\min_R \not< \max_{T(2\epsilon)}$. If this did not hold, R and $T(2\epsilon)$ would intersect, and $\psi(\epsilon) \circ \chi$ would be nonzero in this intersection, which is a contradiction. The fourth statement follows from the second and the fact that R is $(4n-2)\epsilon$-significant.

Since T is $(4n-2)\epsilon$-significant, $\min_T + (4n-2)\epsilon < \max_T$. Thus the second bullet point implies that $\min_{R_m} + 2\epsilon > \min_{T_m} + (4n-2)\epsilon$. The first point gives $\min_{R_i} \geq \min_{T_i} - 2\epsilon$ for $i \neq m$. In a similar fashion, we get from the last two points that $\max_{R_m} \geq \max_T + (4n-4)\epsilon$ and $\max_{R_i} \geq \max_{T_i} - 2\epsilon$ for $i \neq m$. From all this, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(R) &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} u(\min_{R_i}) + u(\max_{R_i}) \\
&\geq u(\min_{T_m}) + u(\max_{T_m}) + 2(4n-4)\epsilon + \sum_{i \neq m} (u(\min_{T_i}) + u(\max_{T_i}) - 4\epsilon) \\
&= \alpha(T) + (4n-4)\epsilon \\
&\geq \alpha(T).
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Equality only holds if $u(\min_{T_m}) + (4n-2)\epsilon = u(\max_{T_m})$, $u(\min_{R_m}) + (4n-2)\epsilon = u(\max_{R_m})$, and $n = 1$. This means that $R = R_1 = T = T_1 = [u(\min_R), u(\min_R) + 2\epsilon]$. As we see, $R \cap T(2\epsilon) = [u(\min_R), u(\min_R)] \neq \varnothing$, so $\psi(\epsilon) \circ \chi \neq 0$. □

We define a function μ by

$$\mu(I) = \{J \in B(N) \mid I \text{ and } J \text{ are } (2n-1)\delta\text{-interleaved}\} \tag{9}$$

for I in $B(M)$. In other words, $\mu(I)$ contains all the intervals that can be matched with I in a $(2n-1)\delta$-matching. Let $I \in B(M)$ be $(4n-2)\delta$-significant, and pick $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $p, p + (4n-2)\delta \in I$. Then, $p + (2n-1)\delta \in J$ for every $J \in \mu(I)$. Since M and N are p.f.d., this means that $\mu(I)$ is a finite set. For $A \subset B(M)$, we write $\mu(A) = \bigcup_{I \in A} \mu(I)$.

Lemma 3.8. *Let A be a finite subset of $B(M)$ containing no $(4n-2)\delta$-trivial elements. Then $|A| \leq |\mu(A)|$.*

Before we prove Lemma 3.8, we show that it implies that there is a $(2n-1)\delta$-matching between $B(M)$ and $B(N)$ and thus completes the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Let G_μ be the undirected bipartite graph on $B(M) \sqcup B(N)$ with an edge between I and J if $J \in \mu(I)$. Observe that G_μ is the same as the graph $G_{(2n-1)\delta}$ we defined when we gave the graph theoretical definition of an ϵ-matching (in this case, $(2n-1)\delta$-matching) in section 2. Following that definition, a $(2n-1)\delta$-matching is a matching in G_μ that covers the set of all $(4n-2)\delta$-significant elements in $B(M)$ and $B(N)$.

For a subset S of a graph G, let $A_G(S)$ be the neighbourhood of S in G, that is, the set of vertices in G that are adjacent to at least one vertex in S. We now apply Hall's marriage theorem [10] to bridge the gap between Lemma 3.8 and the statement we want to prove about matchings.

Theorem 3.9 (Hall's theorem)**.** *Let G be a bipartite graph on bipartite sets X and Y such that $A_G(\{x\})$ is finite for all $x \in X$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- *for all $X' \subset X$, $|X'| \leq |A_G(X')|$*
- *there exists a matching in G covering X.*

One of the two implications is easy, since if $|X'| > |A_G(X')|$ for some $X' \subset X$, then there is no matching in G covering X'. It is the other implication we will use, namely that the first statement is sufficient for a matching in G covering X to exist.

Letting X be the set of $(4n-2)\delta$-significant intervals in $B(M)$ and Y be $B(N)$, Hall's theorem and Lemma 3.8 give us a matching σ in the graph G_μ covering all the $(4n-2)\delta$-significant elements in $B(M)$.[3] By symmetry, we also have a matching τ in G_μ covering all the $(4n-2)\delta$-significant elements in $B(N)$. Neither of these is necessarily a $(2n-1)\delta$-matching, however, as each of them

[3]Strictly speaking, Lemma 3.8 says nothing about infinite A, but the case with A countably infinite follows from the finite cases. Each interval in A contains a rational point, so since M is p.f.d., the cardinality of A is at most finite times countably infinite, which is countable. Thus we have covered all the possible cases.

only guarantees that all the $(4n-2)$-significant intervals in one of the barcodes are matched. We will use σ and τ to construct a $(2n-1)\delta$-matching. This construction is similar to one used to prove the Cantor-Bernstein theorem [1, pp. 110-111].

Let H be the undirected bipartite graph on $B(M) \sqcup B(N)$ for which the set of edges is the union of the edges in the matchings σ and τ. Let C be a connected component of H. Suppose the submatching of σ in C does not cover all the $(4n-2)\delta$-significant elements of C. Then there is a $(4n-2)\delta$-significant $J \in C \cap B(N)$ that is not matched by σ. If we view σ and τ as partial bijections $\sigma : B(M) \nrightarrow B(N)$ and $\tau : B(N) \nrightarrow B(M)$, we can write the connected component of J, which is C, as $\{J, \tau(J), \sigma(\tau(J)), \tau(\sigma(\tau(J))), \dots\}$. Either this sequence is infinite, or it is finite, in which case the last element is $(4n-2)\delta$-trivial. In either case, we get that the submatching of τ in C covers all $(4n-2)\delta$-significant elements in C.

By this argument, there is a $(2n-1)\delta$-matching in each connected component of H. We can piece these together to get a $(2n-1)\delta$-matching in $B(M) \sqcup B(N)$, so Lemma 3.8 completes the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Proof of Lemma 3.8. Because $\leq_\alpha$ is a preorder, we can order $A = \{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_r\}$ so that $I_i \leq_\alpha I_{i'}$ for all $i \leq i'$. Write $\mu(A) = \{J_1, J_2, \dots, J_s\}$. For $I \in B(M)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\mathbb{I}^I, 2\delta} &= \pi_I(2\delta) g(\delta) f|_I \\ &= \pi_I(2\delta) \left(\sum_{J \in B(N)} g|_J \pi_J \right) (\delta) f|_I \\ &= \sum_{J \in B(N)} \pi_I(2\delta) g|_J(\delta) \pi_J(\delta) f|_I \\ &= \sum_{J \in B(N)} g_{J,I}(\delta) f_{I,J}. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Also, $\sum_{J \in B(N)} g_{J,I'}(\delta) f_{I,J} = 0$ for $I \neq I' \in B(M)$, since $\phi_{M,2\delta}$ is zero between different components of M. Lemma 3.6 says that if $g_{J,I'}(\delta) f_{I,J} \neq 0$ and $I \leq_\alpha I'$, then J is $(2n-1)\delta$-interleaved with either I or J'. This means that if $i < i'$, then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_{J \in B(N)} g_{J,I_{i'}}(\delta) f_{I_i,J} \\ &= \sum_{J \in \mu(A)} g_{J,I_{i'}}(\delta) f_{I_i,J}, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

as $g_{J,I_{i'}}(\delta) f_{I_i,J} = 0$ for all J that are not $(2n-1)\delta$-interleaved with either I_i or

$I_{i'}$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{\mathbb{I}^{I_i},2\delta} &= \sum_{J\in B(N)} g_{J,I_i}(\delta) f_{I_i,J} \\ &= \sum_{J\in \mu(A)} g_{J,I_i}(\delta) f_{I_i,J}.\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Writing this in matrix form, we get

$$\begin{bmatrix} g_{J_1,I_1}(\delta) & \cdots & g_{J_s,I_1}(\delta) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ g_{J_1,I_r}(\delta) & \cdots & g_{J_s,I_r}(\delta) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} f_{I_1,J_1} & \cdots & f_{I_r,J_1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ f_{I_1,J_s} & \cdots & f_{I_r,J_s} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{M_{\mathbb{I}^{I_1},2\delta}} & ? & \cdots & ? \\ 0 & \phi_{M_{\mathbb{I}^{I_2},2\delta}} & \cdots & ? \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \phi_{M_{\mathbb{I}^{I_r},2\delta}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

That is, on the right-hand side we have the internal morphisms of the I_i on the diagonal, and 0 below the diagonal.

Recall that a morphism between rectangle modules can be identified with a k-endomorphism, and that in our notation, $f_{I,J}$ and $g_{J,I}$ are given by multiplication by $w(I,J)$ and $w(J,I)$, respectively. For an arbitrary morphism ψ between rectangle modules, we introduce the notation $w(\psi) = c$ if ψ is given by multiplication by c, and 0 otherwise. A consequence of Lemma 3.7 is that $w(g_{J,I_{i'}}(\delta) f_{I_i,J}) = w(g_{J,I_{i'}}) w(f_{I_i,J}) = w(J,I_i) w(I_{i'},J)$ whenever $I_i \leq_\alpha I_{i'}$, in particular if $i \leq i'$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= w\left(\phi_{\mathbb{I}^I,2\delta}\right) \\ &= w\left(\sum_{J\in\mu(A)} g_{J,I_i}(\delta) f_{I_i,J}\right) \\ &= \sum_{J\in\mu(A)} w(g_{J,I_i}(\delta) f_{I_i,J}) \\ &= \sum_{J\in\mu(A)} w(J,I_i) w(I_i,J), \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

and similarly $0 = \sum_{J\in\mu(A)} w(J,I_{i'}) w(I_i,J)$ for $i \leq i'$. Again we can interpret this as a matrix equation:

$$\begin{bmatrix} w(J_1,I_1) & \cdots & w(J_s,I_1) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ w(J_1,I_r) & \cdots & w(J_s,I_r) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w(I_1,J_1) & \cdots & w(I_r,J_1) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ w(I_1,J_s) & \cdots & w(I_r,J_s) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & ? & \cdots & ? \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & ? \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

That is, the right-hand side is an $r \times r$ upper triangular matrix with 1's on the diagonal. The right-hand side has rank $|A|$ and the left-hand side has rank at most $|\mu(A)|$, so the lemma follows immediately from this equation. □

3.2 Free modules

Definition 3.10. We define a *free interval* as an interval of the form $\langle p \rangle := \{q \mid q \geq p\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

For a free interval R, we define $\min_R$ by $R = \langle \min_R \rangle$.[4] We define a *free $\mathbb{R}^n$-module* as an interval decomposable module whose barcode only contains free intervals. It is easy to see that free intervals are rectangles, so it follows from Theorem 3.2 that $d_B(M, N) \leq (2n-1)d_I(M, N)$ for free modules M, N. But because of the geometry of free modules, this result can be strengthened.

Theorem 3.11. *Let M and N be p.f.d. free δ-interleaved $\mathbb{R}^n$-modules with $n \geq 2$. Then there is a $(n-1)\delta$-matching between $B(M)$ and $B(N)$.*

We already did most of the work while proving Theorem 3.2, and there are some obvious simplifications. Firstly, free intervals are ϵ-significant for all $\epsilon \geq 0$. Secondly, for all nonzero $f : \mathbb{I}^R \to \mathbb{I}^S$ and $g : \mathbb{I}^S \to \mathbb{I}^T$ with R, S, T free, gf is nonzero. For $I \in B(M)$, define $\nu(I) = \{J \in B(N) \mid I \text{ and } J \text{ are } (n-1)\delta\text{-interleaved}\}$. By the arguments in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we only need to prove Lemma 3.8 with μ replaced by ν. Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 still hold for free modules, but we need to sharpen Lemma 3.6.

Lemma 3.12. *Let R, S, and T be free intervals with $R \leq_\alpha T$. Suppose there are morphisms $0 \neq f : \mathbb{I}^R \to \mathbb{I}^S(\epsilon)$ and $0 \neq g : \mathbb{I}^S \to \mathbb{I}^T(\epsilon)$. Then $\mathbb{I}^S$ is $(n-1)\epsilon$-interleaved with either $\mathbb{I}^R$ or $\mathbb{I}^T$.*

Proof. In this proof, we treat $\min_I$ and $\max_I$ as undecorated points for all free intervals I, so that we can add them. We have $\min_S \leq \min_R + \epsilon$. Suppose $\mathbb{I}^R$ and $\mathbb{I}^S$ are not $(n-1)\epsilon$-interleaved. Then $\min_S + (n-1)\epsilon \not\geq \min_R$, so for some m, we must have $\min_{S_m} < \min_{R_m} - (n-1)\epsilon$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(S) &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \min_{S_i} \\ &< \min_{R_m} - (n-1)\epsilon + \sum_{i \neq m} (\min_{R_i} + \epsilon) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \min_{R_i} \\ &= \alpha(R). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

We can also prove that $\alpha(T) < \alpha(S)$ if $\mathbb{I}^S$ and $\mathbb{I}^T$ are not $(n-1)\epsilon$-interleaved, so we have $\alpha(T) < \alpha(R)$, a contradiction. □

3.3 Triangle decomposable modules

Another type of modules we are interested in is what we call triangle decomposable modules. Let $\mathbb{R}^2_- = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x + y < 0\}$.

[4] This makes $\min_R$ an undecorated point, while we have previously defined $\min_-$ as decorated points, but this does not matter, as we will not need decorated points in this subsection.



Figure 3: A bounded triangle T.

Definition 3.13. A *triangle* is a nonempty set T of the form $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x < a, y < b\} \setminus \mathbb{R}^2_-$ for some $(a, b) \in (\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\})^2$ with $a + b > 0$.

It follows that triangles are intervals. For a triangle $T = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x < a, y < b\} \setminus \mathbb{R}^2_-$, we write $\max_T = (a, b) \in (\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\})^2$. If T is bounded, $\max_T$ is the maximal element in the closure of T, as illustrated in Figure 3. A *triangle decomposable module* is an interval decomposable $\mathbb{R}^2$-module whose barcode only contains triangles.

Theorem 3.14. *Let M and N be p.f.d. δ-interleaved triangle decomposable modules. Then there is a δ-matching between $B(M)$ and $B(N)$.*

As we did with the rectangles, we can split the triangles into sets of different 'types'. We get four different types of triangles T, depending on whether $\max_T$ is of the form (a, b), (∞, b), (a, ∞), or (∞, ∞) for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Now a result analogous to Lemma 3.5 holds, implying that it is enough to show Theorem 3.14 under the assumption that the barcodes only contain intervals of a single type. The case in which the triangles are bounded is the hardest one, and the only one we will prove. So from now on, we assume all triangles to be bounded.

Again, we reuse parts of the proof of Theorem 3.2. For $I \in B(M)$, we define $\nu(I) = \{J \in B(N) \mid I \text{ and } J \text{ are } \delta\text{-interleaved}\}$. The discussion about Hall's theorem is still valid, so we only need to prove the analogue of Lemma 3.8 for ν. Define $\alpha(T) = \alpha(\langle \max_T \rangle)$. The only things we need to complete the proof of

the analogue of Lemma 3.8 for triangle decomposable modules are the following analogues of Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7:

Lemma 3.15. *Let R, S, and T be triangles with $\alpha(R) \leq \alpha(T)$. Suppose there are morphisms $f : \mathbb{I}^R \to \mathbb{I}^S(\epsilon)$ and $g : \mathbb{I}^S \to \mathbb{I}^T(\epsilon)$ such that $g(\epsilon) \circ f \neq 0$. Then $\mathbb{I}^S$ is ϵ-interleaved with either $\mathbb{I}^R$ or $\mathbb{I}^T$.*

Lemma 3.16. *Let R, S, and T be triangles with T 2ϵ-significant and $\alpha(R) \leq \alpha(T)$. Suppose there are nonzero morphisms $f : \mathbb{I}^R \to \mathbb{I}^S(\epsilon)$ and $g : \mathbb{I}^S \to \mathbb{I}^T(\epsilon)$. Then $g(\epsilon) \circ f \neq 0$.*

Proof of Lemma 3.15. Suppose $\mathbb{I}^R$ and $\mathbb{I}^S$ are not ϵ-interleaved. Then $\max_S \not\geq \max_R - \epsilon$. But at the same time, $\max_R \geq \max_S - \epsilon$, which gives $\alpha(R) > \alpha(S)$. Assuming that $\mathbb{I}^S$ and $\mathbb{I}^T$ are not ϵ-interleaved, either, we also get $\alpha(S) > \alpha(T)$. Thus $\alpha(R) > \alpha(T)$, a contradiction. □

Proof of Lemma 3.16. For all triangles I, we treat $\min_I$ and $\max_I$ as undecorated points. We have $\max_T - \epsilon \leq \max_S$ and $\max_S - \epsilon \leq \max_R$, so $\max_T - 2\epsilon \leq \max_R$. Because T is 2ϵ-significant, $\max_T - 2\epsilon - \epsilon' \notin \mathbb{R}^2_-$ for some $\epsilon' > 0$. Combining these facts, we get $\max_T - 2\epsilon - \epsilon' \in R$, so $(g(\epsilon) \circ f)_{\max_T - 2\epsilon - \epsilon'} \neq 0$. □

3.4 Stability of zigzag modules and Reeb graphs

For any poset P, let P^{op} denote the opposite poset of P, that is, P and P have the same underlying sets, and $i \leq j$ in P^{op} if and only if $j \leq i$ in P. Let $\mathbb{U} = \{(x, y) \mid x + y \geq 0\}$ inherit the poset structure of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbb{R}$. In [5], Botnan and Lesnick define a *block decomposable module* as an interval decomposable $\mathbb{U}$-module whose barcode only contains intervals of one of the following four forms:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\{(x, y) \mid a < x, y < b\} \text{ for } a < b \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\} \\
&\{(x, y) \mid a \leq y < b\} \text{ for } a < b \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\} \\
&\{(x, y) \mid a < x \leq b\} \text{ for } a < b \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\} \\
&\{(x, y) \mid x \leq b, y \geq a\} \text{ for } a, b \in \mathbb{R}
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

They attack the problem of showing that two p.f.d. block decomposable modules are $C\epsilon$-matched whenever they are ϵ-interleaved for a smallest possible $C \geq 1$. They reduce the problem to the case where $B(M)$ and $B(N)$ only contains intervals of one of the four forms mentioned above, and prove the statement for $C = 1$ for each of the three last types. The first case, however, they only prove for $C = \frac{5}{2}$.

Each block decomposable module M correspond to a $\mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbb{R}$-module M' defined by $M'_p = M_p$ and $\phi_{M'}(q, r) = \phi_M(q, r)$ for all $p, q, r \in \mathbb{U}$, and $M'_p = 0$ for $p \notin \mathbb{U}$. Also, the isomorphism $[(x, y) \mapsto (-x, y)]$ between $\mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R}^2$ induces a correspondence between $\mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbb{R}$-modules and $\mathbb{R}^2$-modules, so we get mapping from the set of block decomposable modules to the corresponding $\mathbb{R}^2$-modules. Showing stability for these modules is equivalent to showing stability for the

block decomposable modules. The intervals of the first form above correspond to triangles, so Theorem 3.14 implies that block decomposable modules whose barcodes only contain intervals of the first form above are ϵ-matched if and only if they are ϵ-interleaved. (In fact, our method of proof for Theorems 3.2, 3.11, and 3.14 can be used to show the same result for the other three cases, too, but we will not prove this.) This completes the proof of the following:

Theorem 3.17. *Let M and N be p.f.d. block decomposable modules. Then M and N are ϵ-matched if and only if they are ϵ-interleaved.*

Botnan and Lesnick go on to show that stability for block decomposable modules implies stability for zigzag modules and the persistent homology of Reeb graphs. With their version of Theorem 3.17, which says that an ϵ-interleaving induces a $\frac{5}{2}\epsilon$-matching, they get $d_B(M,N) \leq \frac{5}{2} d_I(M,N)$ for zigzag modules M and N. They also show $d_B(\mathcal{L}_0(\gamma), \mathcal{L}_0(\kappa)) \leq 5 d_I(\gamma, \kappa)$, where γ and κ are Reeb graphs, and $(L)_0$ indicates the 0^{th} level set barcode. With Theorem 3.17, the constants $\frac{5}{2}$ and 5 can be lowered to 1 and 2, respectively, and these constants cannot be improved on. We refer to [5] for the precise statements.

4 Counterexamples to a general algebraic stability theorem

Theorem 3.2 gives an upper bound of $(2n-1)$ on d_B/d_I for rectangle decomposable modules that increases with the dimension. An obvious question is whether it is possible to improve this constant, or if for each $C < 2(n-1)$ there exist pairs M, N of modules for which $d_B(M,N) > C d_I(M,N)$, in which case the bound is optimal. We know that $d_B(M,N) \geq d_I(M,N)$ for any M and N whenever the bottleneck distance is defined, so for $n = 1$, the constant is optimal. For $n > 1$, however, it turns out that the equality $d_B(M,N) = d_I(M,N)$ does not always hold, and the geometry becomes more confusing when n increases. In dimension 2, we give an example of rectangle decomposable modules M and N with $d_B(M,N) = 3 d_I(M,N)$ in Example 4.2, which means that the bound is optimal for $n = 2$, as well. This is a counterexample to a conjecture made in a previous version of [5] which claims that interval decomposable $\mathbb{R}^n$-modules M and N such that $B(M)$ and $B(N)$ only contain convex intervals are ϵ-matched if they are ϵ-interleaved.

Before the example with $d_B(M,N) = 3 d_I(M,N)$, we give a simpler example with $d_B(M,N) = 2 d_I(M,N)$. These easily generalize to give examples with $d_B(M,N) = 2 d_I(M,N)$ and $d_B(M,N) = 3 d_I(M,N)$ in n dimensions for any $n \geq 2$. For instance, one can replace M and N with $M \times I^{n-2}$ and $N \times I^{n-2}$ for a sufficiently large interval I to get such examples in n dimensions. That means that the best we can hope for is to prove $d_B \leq 3 d_I$ for rectangle $\mathbb{R}^n$-modules.

Example 4.1. Let $B(M) = \{I_1, I_2, I_3\}$[5] and $B(N) = \{J\}$, where

[5] Here we use subscripts to index different intervals, not to indicate projections, as we did earlier.



Figure 4: M and N. I_1 and I_2 are the light purple squares, I_3 is deep purple, and J is pink.

- $I_1 = (-3, 1) \times (-1, 3)$
- $I_2 = (-1, 3) \times (-3, 1)$
- $I_3 = (-1, 1) \times (-1, 1)$
- $J = (-2, 2) \times (-2, 2)$.

See Figure 4. We can define 1-interleaving morphisms $f : M \to N(1)$ and $g : N \to M(1)$ by letting $w(I_1, J) = w(I_2, J) = w(I_3, J) = w(J, I_1) = w(J, I_2) = 1$ and $w(J, I_3) = -1$, where w is defined as in the proof of Theorem 3.2. On the other hand, in any matching between $B(M)$ and $B(N)$ we have to leave either I_1 or I_2 unmatched, and they are ϵ-significant for all $\epsilon < 4$. In fact, any possible matching between $B(M)$ and $B(N)$ is a 2-matching. Thus $d_I(M, N) = 1$ and $d_B(M, N) = 2$.

A crucial point is that even though $w(I_1, J)$, $w(J, I_2)$, $w(I_2, J)$, and $w(J, I_1)$ are all nonzero, both $g_{J,I_2} \circ f_{I_1,J}$ and $g_{J,I_1} \circ f_{I_2,J}$ are zero. To do the same with one-dimensional intervals, we would have to shrink I_1 and I_2 so much that they no longer would be 2-significant (see Lemma 3.7), and then they would not need to be matched in a 1-matching. This shows how the geometry of higher dimensions can allow us to construct examples that would not work in lower dimensions.

Next, we give an example of rectangle decomposable $\mathbb{R}^2$-modules M and N such that $d_B(M, N) = 3d_I(M, N)$, proving that our upper bound of $2(n - 1)$ is the best possible for $n = 2$.

Example 4.2. Let $B(M) = \{I_1, I_2, I_3\}$ and $B(N) = \{J_1, J_2, J_3\}$, where

- $I_1 = (0, 10) \times (1, 11)$
- $I_2 = (0, 12) \times (-1, 11)$



Figure 5: I_1, I_2, and I_3 are the filled pink rectangles, and J_1, J_2, and J_3 are the black rectangles without fill.

- $I_3 = (2, 10) \times (1, 9)$
- $J_1 = (1, 11) \times (0, 10)$
- $J_2 = (1, 9) \times (0, 12)$
- $J_3 = (-1, 11) \times (2, 10)$.

The rectangles in $B(M)$ and $B(N)$ are shown in Figure 5.

We give an example of 1-interleaving morphisms f and g that we write on matrix form. In the first matrix, $w(I_i, J_j)$ is in row i, column j. In the second, $w(J_j, I_i)$ is in row j, column i.

$$f : \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \qquad g : \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{16}$$

This means that M and N are 1-interleaved, but they are not ϵ-interleaved for any $\epsilon < 1$, so $d_I(M, N) = 1$.

Let $\epsilon < 3$. We see that the difference between $\max_{I_2} = (12, 11)$ and $\max_{J_2} = (9, 12)$ is 3 in the first coordinate, so I_2 and J_2 are not ϵ-interleaved, and thus they cannot be matched in an ϵ-matching. In fact, I_i and J_j cannot be matched in an ϵ-matching for any $i, j \in \{2, 3\}$ by similar arguments. Since I_2 and I_3

cannot both be matched with J_1, one of them has to be left unmatched, but since both I_2 and I_3 are 6-significant, this means that there is no ϵ-matching between $B(M)$ and $B(N)$. On the other hand, any bijection between $B(M)$ and $B(N)$ is a 3-matching, so $d_B(M,N) = 3$.

There is a strong connection between n-dimensional rectangle decomposable modules and $2n$-dimensional free modules. This is related to the fact that we need $2n$ coordinates to determine an n-dimensional rectangle, and also $2n$ coordinates to determine a $2n$-dimensional free interval. The following example illustrates this connection, as we simply rearrange the coordinates of $\min_R$, $\max_R$ for all rectangles R involved in Example 4.2 to get 4-dimensional free modules with similar properties as in Example 4.2.

Example 4.3. Let $B(M) = \{I_1, I_2, I_3\}$ and $B(N) = \{J_1, J_2, J_3\}$, where

- $I_1 = \langle(0,1,10,11)\rangle$
- $I_2 = \langle(0,-1,12,11)\rangle$
- $I_3 = \langle(2,1,10,9)\rangle$
- $J_1 = \langle(1,0,11,10)\rangle$
- $J_2 = \langle(1,0,9,12)\rangle$
- $J_3 = \langle(-1,2,11,10)\rangle$.

(Compare with the intervals I_i and J_j in Example 4.2.) We have 1-interleaving morphisms defined the same way as in Example 4.2. Just as in that example, we can deduce that there is nothing better than a 3-matching between $B(M)$ and $B(N)$, so $d_B(M,N) = 3$ and $d_I(M,N) = 1$.

As a consequence of this example, we get that our upper bound of $d_B/d_I \leq n-1$ for free n-dimensional modules cannot be improved on for $n = 4$.

5 Isometry for non-p.f.d. modules

In this section we will redefine some of the concepts we have used so far and work in a more general setting. In the spirit of the application of Hall's theorem in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we will use graph theory to find criteria for when results similar to Lemma 3.8 give stability results in more general cases.

Let P denote an arbitrary poset category that we assume to be the underlying poset category throughout the subsection. In section 3, we assumed all modules to be p.f.d. In this section, we drop this assumption, so we always work with general modules unless we explicitly say that they are p.f.d.

We define a *pre-shift functor* as a functor $F : P \to P$ such that $F(p) \geq p$ for all $p \in P$. This induces a functor $-^F : P\textbf{-Mod} \to P\textbf{-Mod}$ given by $M_p^F = M_{F(p)}$ and $\phi_{M^F}(p,q) = \phi_M(F(p), F(q))$, which acts in the obvious way on morphisms. We call functors that can be described in this way *shift functors*.

We call M *F-significant* if $\phi_M(p, F(p)) \neq 0$ for some p, and *F-trivial* otherwise. Two P-modules M and N are *F-interleaved* if there are morphisms $f : M \to N^F$, $g : N \to M^F$ such that $g^F \circ f = \phi_{M,F^2}$ and $f^F \circ g = \phi_{N,F^2}$, where $\phi_{M,G} : M \to M^G$ is given by $(\phi_{M,G})_p = \phi_M(p, G(p))$. An F-matching between multisets of intervals is defined via F-interleavings the same way ϵ-matchings are via ϵ-interleavings.

If we let F act on $\mathbb{R}^n$ by adding $(\epsilon, \ldots, \epsilon)$, we recover our previous examples of shift functors, along with the corresponding definitions we used earlier.

Suppose that F and G are pre-shift functors that commute, that is, $FG = GF$. If we have P-modules L, M, and N, and pairs

$$\begin{aligned} f : L \to M^F,\ g : M \to L^F \\ f' : M \to N^G,\ g' : N \to M^G \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

of interleaving morphisms, then $(f')^F \circ f$ and $g^G \circ g'$ are FG-interleaving morphisms. In other words, if L and M are F-interleaved and M and N are G-interleaved, then L and N are FG-interleaved.

For the remainder of the chapter, we assume $\mathscr{I}$ to be a set of intervals of some poset P that satisfies the following: Let $I \in \mathscr{I}$ and suppose we have an uncountable set of nonzero morphisms $\{f_l : \mathbb{I}^I \to \mathbb{I}^{J_l}\}_{l \in \Lambda}$, where $\{J_l\}_{l \in \Lambda} \subset \mathscr{I}$. Then there is no morphism $f : \mathbb{I}^I \to \bigoplus_{l \in \Lambda} \mathbb{I}^{J_l}$ such that $f_l = \pi_{J_l} \circ f$ for all $l \in \Lambda$, where π_{J_k} is the projection $\bigoplus_{l \in \Lambda} \mathbb{I}^{J_l} \to \mathbb{I}^{J_k}$.

In addition, we assume that $\mathscr{I}$ is closed under all the pre-shift functors we consider in the rest of the chapter. By $\mathscr{I}$ being 'closed under' a pre-shift functor F, we mean that if $I \in \mathscr{I}$, then $\{F(p) \mid p \in I\} \in \mathscr{I}$. We say that M is an $\mathscr{I}$-module if M is interval decomposable and all the intervals in $B(M)$ are in $\mathscr{I}$.

The set of rectangles in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is an example of a set of intervals that satisfies the conditions above, if we only consider the standard shift functors on $\mathbb{R}^n$. The ϵ-shift of a rectangle is a rectangle, and if we have nonzero morphisms $f_l : \mathbb{I}^R \to \mathbb{I}^{R_l}$, where R and R_l for all l in some uncountable index set Λ are rectangles, then there must be a point $p \in R$ that also lies in R_l for an infinite number of $l \in \Lambda$.[6] If we then have a morphism $f : \mathbb{I}^R \to \bigoplus_{l \in \Lambda} \mathbb{I}^{R_l}$ as described above, the image of the homomorphism $f_p : k \to \bigoplus_{l \in \Lambda} k$ must have a nonzero projection on infinitely many copies of k, which is a contradiction.

Let $f : M \to N^F$ and $g : N \to M^F$ be interleaving morphisms, and assume that M and N are $\mathscr{I}$-modules. Define a bipartite directed graph Γ on $B(M) \sqcup B(N)$ by letting there be an arrow from $I \in B(M)$ to $J \in B(N)$ iff $f_{I,J} \neq 0$, and an arrow in the opposite direction iff $g_{J,I} \neq 0$, where $f_{I,J}$ and $g_{J,I}$ are defined as in the proof of Theorem 3.2. That is,

[6] If $n = 1$ and R is a closed interval $[a, b]$, we can pick $p = b$. If $R = (a, b)$, we can choose a sequence $p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \ldots$ that approaches b. Each R_l has to contain a point in the sequence, and by arguments about set cardinality, one of the points in the sequence is contained in infinitely many R_l. Arguments for other intervals and $n > 1$ are similar.

$$\begin{aligned} f_{I,J} &= \pi_J^F \circ f \circ \iota_I : \mathbb{I}^I \to (\mathbb{I}^J)^F \\ g_{J,I} &= \pi_I^F \circ g \circ \iota_J : \mathbb{I}^J \to (\mathbb{I}^I)^F. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Let $\sim$ be the relation on $B(M) \sqcup B(N)$ defined by letting $I \sim I'$ if and only if there is a path both from I to I' and from I' to I in Γ. One can easily check that $\sim$ is symmetric, transitive, and reflexive (we always have the trivial path from I to I), so it is an equivalence relation.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $f : M \to N^F$ and $g : N \to M^F$ be F-interleaving morphisms, where M and N are $\mathscr{I}$-modules. Let $\sim$ be defined as above, and let $\mathscr{C}$ be one of its equivalence classes. Then*

- *$\mathscr{C}$ is countable, and*
- *$f_{\mathscr{C}} : M_{\mathscr{C}} \to N_{\mathscr{C}}^F$ and $g_{\mathscr{C}} : N_{\mathscr{C}} \to M_{\mathscr{C}}^F$ are interleaving morphisms,*

where $M_{\mathscr{C}} = \bigoplus_{I \in \mathscr{C} \cap B(M)} \mathbb{I}^I$ and $N_{\mathscr{C}} = \bigoplus_{J \in \mathscr{C} \cap B(N)} \mathbb{I}^I$, and $f_{\mathscr{C}}$ and $g_{\mathscr{C}}$ are the compositions

$$\begin{aligned} &\bigoplus_{I \in \mathscr{C} \cap B(M)} \mathbb{I}^I \xrightarrow{\iota} \bigoplus_{I \in B(M)} \mathbb{I}^I \xrightarrow{f} \bigoplus_{J \in B(N)} \mathbb{I}^J \xrightarrow{\pi} \bigoplus_{J \in \mathscr{C} \cap B(N)} \mathbb{I}^J, \\ &\bigoplus_{J \in \mathscr{C} \cap B(N)} \mathbb{I}^J \xrightarrow{\iota} \bigoplus_{J \in B(N)} \mathbb{I}^J \xrightarrow{g} \bigoplus_{I \in B(M)} \mathbb{I}^I \xrightarrow{\pi} \bigoplus_{J \in \mathscr{C} \cap B(M)} \mathbb{I}^I, \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

respectively.

Proof. First we prove that an arbitrary equivalence class $\mathscr{C}$ is countable. For an interval $I \in \mathscr{C}$, let T_I be the multiset of nodes in Γ such that $J \in T_I$ iff there is an arrow from I to J. Then (assuming $I \in B(M)$ for ease of notation) the composition

$$\mathbb{I}^I \xrightarrow{\iota_I} M \xrightarrow{f} N \xrightarrow{\pi} \bigoplus_{J \in T_I} \mathbb{I}^J \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathbb{I}^K \tag{20}$$

is equal to $f_{I,K}$ for all $K \in T_I$. Here the π's represent the relevant projection morphisms. By our assumption on $\mathscr{I}$ above, T_I must be countable. Since this holds for all the nodes in Γ, we also have that the set of nodes that can be reached by (finite) paths from I is countable. It follows that $\mathscr{C}$ is countable.

To prove that $f_{\mathscr{C}}$ and $g_{\mathscr{C}}$ are interleaving morphisms, it is enough to show that for all $I, I' \in \mathscr{C} \cap B(M)$, the compositions

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{I}^I \xrightarrow{\iota_I} M \xrightarrow{f} N \xrightarrow{g} M \xrightarrow{\pi_{I'}} \mathbb{I}^{I'} \\ &\mathbb{I}^I \xrightarrow{\iota_I} M_{\mathscr{C}} \xrightarrow{f_{\mathscr{C}}} N_{\mathscr{C}} \xrightarrow{g_{\mathscr{C}}} M_{\mathscr{C}} \xrightarrow{\pi_{I'}} \mathbb{I}^{I'} \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

are equal, as we already know that f and g are interleaving morphisms. The corresponding statement for $J, J' \in \mathscr{C} \cap B(N)$ follows by symmetry. This is equivalent to the equation

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{J \in B(N)} g_{J,I'} f_{I,J} = \sum_{J \in \mathscr{C} \cap B(N)} g_{J,I'} f_{I,J} \\ \Leftrightarrow &\sum_{J \in B(N) \setminus \mathscr{C}} g_{J,I'} f_{I,J} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Suppose $g_{J,I'} f_{I,J} \neq 0$ for some $J \in B(N) \setminus \mathscr{C}$. Then there are arrows from I to J and from J to I' in Γ, as well as a path from I' to I, since $I \sim I'$. In other words, there is a path both from I to J and from J to I in Γ, which is a contradiction, as $I \nsim J$. □

We say that a set S of intervals is *F-small* if S is finite, or there exists an infinite subset $S' \subset S$ such that all pairs of intervals in S' are F-interleaved. Let M and N be interval decomposable persistence modules. For $A \subset B(M)$, we define

$$\mu_M^F(A) = \{J \in B(N) \mid \exists I \in A : I \text{ and } J \text{ are } F\text{-interleaved}\} \tag{23}$$

and write $\mu_M^F(I) = \mu_M^F(\{I\})$. If M and F are known from context, we might write just $\mu(A)$. M and N are said to satisfy the *F-condition* if

$$\begin{aligned} |A| &\leq |\mu_N^F(A)| \text{ and} \\ |A'| &\leq |\mu_M^F(A')| \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

hold for all subsets $A \subset B(M)$ and $A' \subset B(N)$ of F^2-significant intervals.

Theorem 5.2. *Let F, G, and H be pre-shift functors such that G and H commute. Suppose all F-interleaved $\mathscr{I}$-modules satisfy the G-condition. Suppose also that every subset of $\{J \in \mathscr{I} \mid \mathbb{I}^I$ and $\mathbb{I}^J$ are G-interleaved$\}$ is H-small for all G^2-significant $I \in \mathscr{I}$. Then all (not necessarily p.f.d.) F-interleaved $\mathscr{I}$-modules M and N are GH-matched.*

Before we prove Theorem 5.2, we provide some context by showing how to apply the theorem to rectangle decomposable, free, and triangle decomposable modules. The statements we get are a little weaker than the ones we got in Theorems 3.2, 3.11, and 3.14, but this time they hold for all persistence modules, not just p.f.d. modules.

Corollary 5.3. *Let M and N be rectangle decomposable $\mathbb{R}^n$-modules. Then $d_B(M, N) \leq (2n-1) d_I(M, N)$.*

Corollary 5.4. *Let M and N be free $\mathbb{R}^n$-modules with $n \geq 2$. Then $d_B(M, N) \leq (n-1) d_I(M, N)$.*

Corollary 5.5. *Let M and N be triangle decomposable modules. Then $d_B(M, N) = d_I(M, N)$.*

Proof of Corollary 5.3. In Theorem 5.2, choose $\mathscr{I}$ as the set of rectangle $\mathbb{R}^n$-modules. Let $(-)^F$ be the ϵ-shift functor, $(-)^G$ the $(2n-1)\epsilon$-shift functor, and H the δ-shift functor for some $\epsilon \geq 0$, $\delta > 0$. G and H obviously commute. Lemma 3.8 states that F-interleaved p.f.d. rectangle decomposable modules satisfy the G-condition. However, we never assumed that the modules were p.f.d. in the proof of Lemma 3.8, so we have the result for non-p.f.d. modules as well.

Next, we need that every subset of $\{J \in \mathscr{I} \mid I \text{ and } J \text{ are } G\text{-interleaved}\}$ is H-small for all (G^2-significant) $I \in \mathscr{I}$. In other words, if $(J_1, J_2, \dots)$ is an infinite sequence of rectangles that are $(2n-1)\epsilon$-interleaved with a rectangle I, then we must show that it contains an infinite subsequence of intervals that are pairwise δ-interleaved. Each of the intervals belongs to one of the 'types' we defined in the proof of Theorem 3.2, so it is enough to prove the statement for each of the types, as the sequence must contain an infinite number of intervals of at least one of the types.

One of the types is the set of bounded rectangles. Let us first assume that the sequence only contains rectangles of this type. There is a function from the set of bounded rectangles to $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ given by $R \mapsto (\min_R, \max_R)$, and this sends the sequence $(J_1, J_2, \dots)$ to a sequence $(j_1, j_2, \dots)$ of points in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$. Two bounded rectangle modules $\mathbb{I}^R$ and $\mathbb{I}^S$ are δ-interleaved if all the coordinates in $\min_R$ and $\min_S$, and $\max_R$ and $\max_S$ differ by less than δ. This means that if $|j_a - j_b| < \delta$ in the ordinary euclidean distance, then J_a and J_b are δ-interleaved. On the other hand, the fact that all the intervals in $(J_1, J_2, \dots)$ are $(4n-2)\epsilon$-interleaved implies that $|j_a - j_b| \leq 2n(4n-2)\epsilon$. Thus $(j_1, j_2, \dots)$ is an infinite sequence of points in a bounded region of $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$, so it must have an accumulation point. An open ball with diameter δ around such an accumulation point contains an infinite subsequence of $(j_1, j_2, \dots)$ corresponding to an infinite subsequence of $(J_1, J_2, \dots)$ of pairwise δ-interleaved rectangles.

Assume instead that $\{J_1, J_2, \dots\}$ only contains rectangles of another fixed type. Again we can define a function similar to the one above, but we have to be a little careful, as $\min_R$ and $\max_R$ do not exist in general for R of these types. Instead we can send $R = R_1 \times R_2 \times \cdots \times R_n$ to a vector of the endpoints of the R_i's in a canonical order, ignoring infinite endpoints. As rectangles of the same type have infinite endpoints at the same places, we have a function with all the same nice properties as in the case with bounded rectangles, and the same argument as above works.

Thus both of the conditions in Theorem 5.2 hold, and we can reap the fruits of our labor: if M and N are ϵ-interleaved, they are $((2n-1)\epsilon + \delta)$-matched for all $\delta > 0$. This implies $d_B(M, N) \leq (2n-1)d_I(M, N)$. □

Corollaries 5.4 and 5.5 can be proved similarly.[7] We have a well-defined map from the free modules to $\mathbb{R}^n$ given by $I \mapsto \min_I$, and we can define similar maps for each type of triangle. The rest of the proofs are just about the same as for rectangle decomposable modules.

We now prove Theorem 5.2.

[7]The set of triangles is not closed under shift, but Lemma 5.1 holds for the set of all triangles and shifts of triangles, which is. This is in reality enough to prove Corollary 5.5.

Proof of Theorem 5.2. We first apply Lemma 5.1 to split the problem into a set of cases with countable barcodes. If we can find a GH-matching in each of those cases, the matchings assemble into a GH-matching between $B(M)$ and $B(N)$. With this in mind, we assume $B(M)$ and $B(N)$ to be countable.

By using the same strategy as in the discussion after Lemma 3.8, we can apply Hall's theorem to obtain a matching $\sigma : B(M) \nrightarrow B(N)$ matching all G^2-significant intervals $I \in B(M)$ and $J \in B(N)$ for which $\mu_G^N(I)$ and $\mu_G^M(J)$ are finite. The problem is that there might be I or J such that $\mu_G^N(I)$ or $\mu_G^M(J)$ is infinite. Let $I \in B(M)$ be such an interval. Since $\mu(I)$ is H-small, we can find an infinite subset $S_I \subset \mu(I)$ of pairwise H-interleaved intervals. Pick such sets S_I and S_J for all $I \in B(M)$, $J \in B(N)$ that are not matched by σ and for which $\mu(I)$ and $\mu(J)$ are infinite.

Lemma 5.6. *The sets S_I, S_J can be chosen so that they are pairwise disjoint, and moreover such that for any I and J, there are no $I' \in S_I$, $J' \in S_J$ such that $\sigma(I') = J'$.*

Proof. To simplify the problem, we let $I' \sim J'$ if $\sigma(I') = J'$, and, whenever S_I is defined, we view S_I as a set of equivalence classes of the equivalence relation generated by $\sim$. Since everything is countable, the problem can be rephrased as follows: let $N_1, N_2, \dots \subset \mathbb{N}$ be infinite subsets. Are there infinite subsets $N_i' \subset N_i$ for all i such that $N_i' \cap N_j' = \varnothing$ for all $i \neq j$?

We begin by constructing $N_1' = \{n_1, n_2, \dots\}$. Let n_1 be any element in N_1. Using induction on i, we can pick $n_i \in N_1$ so that each N_k for $2 \leq k \leq i$ contains an element a_k such that $n_{i-1} < a_k < n_i$. We see that for any $j \geq 2$, N_j contains at least one element between n_{j-1} and n_j, one between n_j and n_{j+1}, one between n_{j+1} and n_{j+2}, and so on. In other words, $N_j \setminus N_1'$ is infinite for all $j \geq 2$. This means that we can repeat the construction for N_2', and then N_3', and so on, so we have shown what we wanted. □

Assume that all S_I, S_J are chosen as in the lemma. We construct a GH-matching $\tau : B(M) \nrightarrow B(N)$ by induction. Our plan is to start with $\tau_0 = \sigma$ and construct matchings $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots$ that match more and more of the G^2-significant intervals that were not matched by σ such that we have a well-defined GH-matching in the limit.

Choose an arbitrary ordering $\{I_1, I_2, I_3, \dots\} = \{I \in B(M) \sqcup B(N) \mid S_I \text{ is defined}\}$. Assume as the induction hypothesis that τ_i matches $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_i$ as well as all the intervals matched by τ_{i-1}. Write $I = I_{i+1}$ and choose another arbitrary ordering $\{s_I^1, s_I^2, \dots\} = S_I \setminus \{I_1, I_2, \dots I_i\}$. Define $\bar{S}_I$ as follows:

- if all of $S_I \setminus \{I_1, I_2, \dots I_i\}$ is matched by τ_{i-1}, then $\bar{S}_I = S_I \setminus \{I_1, I_2, \dots I_i\}$,
- if not, $\bar{S}_I = \{s_I^1, s_I^2, \dots, s_I^m\}$, where s_I^m is not matched by τ_{i-1}, but $s_I^1, s_I^2, \dots, s_I^{m-1}$ are.

Assume $I \in B(N)$. This has no significance for our argument; we do it just so that we know whether we need to work with τ_i and τ_{i+1}, or their inverses. If I is matched by τ_i, let $\tau_{i+1} = \tau_i$. Otherwise, define τ_{i+1} by

- $\tau_{i+1}(s_I^1) = I$
- $\tau_{i+1}(s_I^k) = \tau_i(s_I^{k-1})$ for all $s_I^k \in \bar{S}_I$
- $\tau_{i+1}(J) = \tau_i(J)$ for all $J \in \operatorname{coim} \tau_i \setminus \bar{S}_I$

The idea is illustrated below: we 'shift' τ_i one step to the left along $\bar{S}_I$, and leave τ_i unchanged everywhere else. This way, only I and members of $\bar{S}_I$ and $\tau_i(\bar{S}_I)$ are either matched with different elements by τ_i and τ_{i+1}, or only matched by τ_{i+1}. No intervals are matched by τ_i, but not by τ_{i+1}.



(25)

Because we chose the sets $S_{I_1}, S_{I_2}, \ldots, S_{I_i}$ as described in Lemma 5.6, we know that $\tau_i(s_I^k) = \sigma(s_I^k)$ for all $s_I^k \in \bar{S}_I$ whenever $\tau_i(s_I^k)$ is defined. J and $\sigma(J)$ are G-interleaved for all $J \in \operatorname{coim} \sigma$, so we get that s_I^k and $\tau_i(s_I^k)$ are G-interleaved. Because s_I^k is H-interleaved with s_I^{k+1}, s_I^{k+1} is GH-interleaved with $\tau_i(s_I^k) = \tau_{i+1}(s_I^{k+1})$. We also know that I and s_I^1 are G-interleaved, and thus GH-interleaved.

It follows by induction that for all i, τ_i matches $I_1, I_2, \ldots, I_i$, as well as all elements that are matched by σ. It also follows from the definition of $\bar{S}_{I_1}, \bar{S}_{I_2}, \ldots$ and $\tau_0, \tau_1, \ldots$ that if τ_i and τ_{i+1} match some interval J with different intervals, then J is either in $\bar{S}_{I_i}$ or in $\sigma(\bar{S}_{I_i})$, which means that $\tau_{i+1}, \tau_{i+2}, \ldots$ all match J with the same interval. This means that we can define τ by $\tau(I) = \lim_{i\to\infty} \tau_i(I)$ for all I for which there exists an i such that $\tau_i(I)$ is defined. Then τ matches all the intervals that σ matches in addition to $I_1, I_2, \ldots$, and $\tau(I)$ and I are GH-interleaved whenever $\tau(I)$ is defined, so τ is a GH-matching. □

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my master's supervisor Nils Baas and co-supervisor Gereon Quick for invaluable support and help. I would also like to thank Peter Landweber for detailed comments on several drafts of this text, Steve Oudot for feedback on the first arXiv version, and Magnus Bakke Botnan for interesting discussions.

References

[1] Martin Aigner and Günter M. Ziegler. *Proofs from THE BOOK*. Springer, 4th edition, 2010.

[2] Gorô Azumaya. Corrections and supplementaries to my paper concerning Krull-Remak-Schmidt's theorem. *Nagoya Mathematical Journal*, 1:117–124, 1950.

[3] Ulrich Bauer and Michael Lesnick. Induced matchings and the algebraic stability of persistence barcodes. *Journal of Computational Geometry*, 6(2):162–191, 2015.

[4] Håvard Bakke Bjerkevik. Stability of persistence modules. *Master's Thesis, NTNU, Trondheim*, June 2016.

[5] Magnus Bakke Botnan and Michael Lesnick. Algebraic stability of zigzag persistence modules. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.00655*, 2016.

[6] Frédéric Chazal, David Cohen-Steiner, Marc Glisse, Leonidas J Guibas, and Steve Y Oudot. Proximity of persistence modules and their diagrams. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual symposium on Computational geometry*, pages 237–246. ACM, 2009.

[7] Frédéric Chazal, Vin De Silva, Marc Glisse, and Steve Oudot. The structure and stability of persistence modules. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1207.3674*, 2012.

[8] David Cohen-Steiner, Herbert Edelsbrunner, and John Harer. Stability of persistence diagrams. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 37(1):103–120, 2007.

[9] William Crawley-Boevey. Decomposition of pointwise finite-dimensional persistence modules. *Journal of Algebra and Its Applications*, 14(05):1550066, 2015.

[10] Philip Hall. On representatives of subsets. *J. London Math. Soc*, 10(1):26–30, 1935.

[11] Cary Webb. Decomposition of graded modules. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 94(4):565–571, 1985.

Department of Mathematical Sciences, NTNU, Norway
E-mail address: havard.bjerkevik@math.ntnu.no